

DEFORMATIONS OF CHIRAL TWO-FORMS IN SIX DIMENSIONS

XAVIER BEKAERT¹, MARC HENNEAUX¹ and ALEXANDER SEVRIN²¹*Physique Théorique et Mathématique, Université Libre de Bruxelles,
Campus Plaine C.P. 231, B-1050 Bruxelles, Belgium*²*Theoretische Natuurkunde, Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Pleinlaan 2, B-1050 Brussel, Belgium*

ABSTRACT

Motivated by a system consisting of a number of parallel M5-branes, we study possible local deformations of chiral two-forms in six dimensions. Working to first order in the coupling constant, this reduces to the study of the local BRST cohomological group at ghost number zero. We obtain an exhaustive list of all possible deformations. None of them allows for a satisfactory formulation of the M5-branes system leading to the conclusion that no local field theory can describe such a system.

The M5-brane is perhaps the most elusive object in M-theory [1]. In the limit where bulk gravity decouples, it is described by a six-dimensional field theory. In order to match the eight propagating fermionic degrees of freedom, its bosonic sector has to include, besides the five scalar fields which describe the position of the brane in transverse space, a chiral two-form transforming as the (3,1) of the little group $SU(2) \times SU(2)$. The latter reflects that M2-branes may end on M5-branes. The resulting theory is an $N = (2, 0)$ superconformal field theory in six dimensions [2].

A single M5 brane with strong classical fields is well understood; its Lagrangian is described in [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. However, when several, say n , M5-branes coincide, little is known. Compactifying one dimension of M-theory on a circle yields type IIA string theory. If the M5-branes are taken transversal to the compact direction, they become n coinciding NS5-branes in type IIA, again a poorly understood system. However, if the branes are longitudinal to the compact direction, the M5-branes appear as a set of coinciding D4-branes which are quite well understood. Their dynamics is governed by a five-dimensional $U(n)$ Born-Infeld theory which, ignoring higher derivative terms, is an ordinary $U(n)$ non-abelian gauge theory. Turning back to the eleven dimensional picture, this suggests that a non-abelian extension of the chiral two-form should exist.

However, there are several indications that this is a highly unusual system. Both entropy considerations [8, 9] and the calculation of the conformal anomaly of the partition function [10] show that the theory should have n^3 instead of n^2 degrees of

freedom. In [11] it was argued on geometric grounds, that for $p > 1$, non-chiral p -forms do not allow for non-abelian extensions. In [12], geometric prejudices were dropped, and general deformations of non-chiral p -forms were classified to first order in the coupling constant. Though both known and novel deformations were discovered, none of them had the required property that the p -form gauge algebra becomes genuinely non-abelian.

In the present letter we will specifically focus on deformations of chiral two-forms in six dimensions. By construction, these deformations are continuously connected to the free theory. We will ignore the fermions and the scalar fields as we believe that they will not modify our conclusions. In fact this can easily be proven for the scalar fields because they are inert under the two-form gauge symmetry.

Our starting point is the action of [13],

$$S[A_{ij}^A] = \sum_A \int d^6x (B^{Aij} \dot{A}_{ij}^A - B^{Aij} B_{ij}^A) \quad (1)$$

for a collection of N free chiral 2-forms A_{ij}^A , $(i, j, \dots = 1, \dots, 5)$, $(A = 1, \dots, N)$, where N is arbitrary and could e.g. be equal to n^3 . The magnetic fields B^{Aij} in (1) are defined through

$$B_{ij}^A = \frac{1}{3!} \epsilon_{ijklm} F^{Aklm}, \quad F_{ijk}^A = \partial_i A_{jk}^A + \partial_j A_{ki}^A + \partial_k A_{ij}^A. \quad (2)$$

If one varies the action with respect to the 2-forms A_{ij}^A , one gets as equations of motion

$$\epsilon^{ijklm} \partial_0 \partial_k A_{lm}^A - 2 \partial_k F^{Aki j} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \epsilon^{ijklm} \partial_k (\partial_0 A_{lm}^A - B_{lm}^A) = 0 \quad (3)$$

which imply, assuming the second Betti number of the spatial sections to vanish,

$$\partial_0 A_{lm}^A - B_{lm}^A = \partial_l u_m^A - \partial_m u_l^A \quad (4)$$

for some arbitrary spatial 1-forms u_m^A . If one identifies u_m^A with A_{0m}^A (which is pure gauge), one may rewrite the equation (4) as

$$E_{ij}^A = B_{ij}^A \quad (5)$$

where the E 's are the electric fields, $E_{ij}^A = F_{0ij}^A$. Covariantly, this is equivalent to the self-duality condition $F_{\lambda\mu\nu}^A = {}^* F_{\lambda\mu\nu}^A$. By gauge-fixing the gauge freedom of the theory,

$$\delta_\Lambda A_{ij}^A = \partial_i \Lambda_j^A - \partial_j \Lambda_i^A \quad (6)$$

one may set $u_m^A = 0$. One gets then the equations in the ‘‘temporal gauge’’, $\partial_0 A_{lm}^A - B_{lm}^A = 0$.

The action (1) may be covariantized by adding appropriate auxiliary and gauge fields. One gets in this manner the free action of [6]. Conversely, one may fall back

on (1) by partly gauge-fixing the PST Lagrangian. Thus a consistent deformation of the PST Lagrangian defines a consistent deformation of (1). Though the action (1) is significantly simpler to handle than the PST Lagrangian, we pay the price that our analysis is not manifestly Lorentz invariant. Without enforcing Lorentz invariance, we will already obtain strong constraints on the allowed deformations. We shall come back to Lorentz invariance at the end of this letter.

Our strategy for studying the possible local deformations of the action (1) is based on the observation that these are in bijective correspondence with the local BRST cohomological group $H^{0,6}(s|d)$ [14], where s is the BRST differential acting on the fields, the ghosts, and their conjugate antifields, d is the ordinary space-time exterior derivative and the upper indices refer to ghost number and form degree resp. In the present case, s is given by

$$s = \delta + \gamma \quad (7)$$

with

$$\delta A_{ij}^A = \delta C_i^A = \delta \eta^A = 0, \quad (8)$$

$$\delta A^{*Aij} = 2\partial_k F^{Aki j} - \epsilon^{ijklm} \partial_k \dot{A}_{lm}^A, \quad (9)$$

$$\delta C^{*Ai} = \partial_j A^{*Aij}, \quad (10)$$

$$\delta \eta^{*A} = \partial_i C^{*Ai} \quad (11)$$

and

$$\gamma A_{ij}^A = \partial_i C_j^A - \partial_j C_i^A, \quad (12)$$

$$\gamma C_i^A = \partial_i \eta^A, \quad \gamma \eta^A = 0, \quad (13)$$

$$\gamma A^{*Aij} = \gamma C^{*Ai} = \gamma \eta^{*A} = 0. \quad (14)$$

The C_i^A are the ghosts, the η^A are the ghosts of ghosts, while the A^{*Aij} , C^{*Ai} and η^{*A} are the antifields. One verifies that $\delta^2 = \gamma^2 = \delta\gamma + \gamma\delta = 0$. The cocycle condition defining elements of $H^{0,6}(s|d)$ is the ‘‘Wess-Zumino condition’’ at ghost number zero,

$$sa + db = 0, \quad gh(a) = 0 \quad (15)$$

Any solution of (15) defines a consistent deformation of the action (1) through $S[A_{ij}^A] \rightarrow S[A_{ij}^A] + g \int d^6 x a_0$, where a_0 is the antifield-independent component of a . The deformation is consistent to first-order in g , in the sense that one can simultaneously deform the original gauge symmetry (6) in such a way that the deformed action is invariant under the deformed gauge symmetry up to terms of order g (included). The antifield-dependent components of a contain informations about the deformation of the gauge symmetry. Trivial solutions of (15) are of the form $a = \gamma c + de$ and

correspond to a_0 's that can be redefined away through field redefinitions. Of course, there are also consistency conditions on the deformations arising from higher-order terms (g^2 and higher), but it turns out that in the case at hand, consistency to first order already restricts dramatically the possibilities.

There are three possible types of consistent deformations of the action. First, one may deform the action without modifying the gauge symmetry. In that case, a does not depend on the antifields, $a = a_0$. These deformations contain only strictly gauge-invariant terms, i.e., polynomials in the abelian curvatures and their derivatives (Born-Infeld terms are in this category) as well as Chern-Simons terms, which are (off-shell) gauge-invariant under the abelian gauge symmetry up to a total derivative. An example of a Chern-Simons term is given by the kinetic term of (1), which can be rewritten as $F \wedge \partial_0 A$ (in writing Chern-Simons terms, the spatial 2-forms A^A and their successive time derivatives, which are also spatial 2-forms, are effectively independent). Second, one may deform the action and the gauge transformations while keeping their algebra invariant. In BRST terms, the corresponding cocycles involve (non trivially) the antifields A^{*Aij} but not C^{*Ai} or η^{*A} . Finally, one may deform everything, including the gauge algebra; the corresponding cocycles involve all the antifields.

Reformulating the problem of deforming the free action (1) in terms of BRST cohomology enables one to use the powerful tools of homological algebra. Following the approach of [12], we have completely worked out the BRST cohomological classes at ghost number zero. In particular, we have established that one can always get rid of the antifields by adding trivial solutions. *In other words, the only consistent interactions for a system of chiral 2-forms in six dimensions are (up to redefinitions) deformations that do not modify the gauge symmetries (6) of the free theory.* These involve the abelian curvatures or Chern-Simons terms. There are no other consistent, local, deformations.

We shall give the detailed proof of this assertion in a separate publication [15]. We shall just outline here the general skeleton of the proof, which parallels the analysis of [16, 12] rather closely, emphasizing only the new features.

To find the general solution of (15), one expands a according to the antifields, i.e., more precisely, according to the antighost number,

$$a = a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_k, \quad \text{antigh}(a_i) = i. \quad (16)$$

The only variables with non-vanishing antighost number are the antifields, with $\text{antigh}(A^{*Aij}) = 1$, $\text{antigh}(C^{*Ai}) = 2$ and $\text{antigh}(\eta^{*A}) = 3$. A similar expansion holds for b . The fact that k remains finite follows from demanding locality in the sense that the number of derivatives in both the deformations of the action and in

the deformations of the gauge transformations remains finite [16]. What we must show is that one can eliminate all the terms in (16) but the antifield-independent component a_0 . So, let us assume $k > 0$ and finite.

The last term in the expansion (16) must fulfill $\gamma a_k + db_k = 0$ from (15). As in the non-chiral case, one may assume $b_k = 0$ through redefinitions ($k > 0$). Thus, $\gamma a_k = 0$ and one must determine the general cocycle of the γ -differential. It is here that there is a difference with the non-chiral case. Indeed, the time derivatives of the ghosts of ghosts η^A are now in the γ -cohomology, while they are trivial in the non-chiral case, where one has $\gamma C_0^A = \partial_0 \eta^A$. In the chiral case, however, there is no ghost C_0^A , so $\partial_0 \eta^A$ is a non-trivial γ -cocycle (at ghost number two). A similar property holds for the higher-order time derivatives of η^A . One easily verifies that these are the only generators of the γ -cohomology at positive ghost number. The other generators of the cohomology are the curvatures, the antifields and their spacetime derivatives. Thus, up to trivial terms that can be absorbed, one may write the last term a_k in (16) as

$$a_k = \sum_I P^I \omega^I \quad (17)$$

where (i) the P^I are 6-forms constructed out of the antifields, the curvatures, their spacetime derivatives and the dx^μ 's; and (ii) the ω^I are a basis of the vector space of polynomials in the ghosts of ghosts η^A and their successive time-derivatives. Furthermore, $\text{antigh}(P^I) = \text{antigh}(a_k) = k$ (by assumption) and $gh(\omega^I) = k$ so that $gh(a_k) = gh(\omega^I) - \text{antigh}(P^I) = 0$. This shows that k must be even since the η^A 's and their successive time-derivatives have even ghost number. Thus, if k is odd, a_k is trivial and can be entirely removed.

Turn now to the next equation following from (15),

$$\gamma a_{k-1} + \delta a_k + db_{k-1} = 0 \quad (18)$$

By following the same line of thought as for non-chiral systems [16], and using in addition an argument based on counting time-derivatives of the ghosts of ghosts, one easily proves that P^I must take the form $P^I = Q^I dx^0$ (up to trivial terms), where Q^I is a spatial 5-form (polynomial of degree 5 in the spatial dx^k 's) solution of $\delta Q^I + \tilde{d}R^I = 0$. Here, $\tilde{d}$ is the spatial exterior derivative, $d \equiv \partial_k dx^k$. Furthermore, in order for (17) to be non-trivial, Q^I must be a non-trivial solution, i.e., not of the form $\delta M^I + \tilde{d}N^I$. The analysis of [12] imply that there are non-trivial solutions of $\delta Q^I + \tilde{d}R^I = 0$ only for $\text{antigh}(Q^I) = 1$ or 3. In particular, all solutions of $\delta Q^I + \tilde{d}R^I = 0$ are trivial in even ghost number, which is the relevant case for us since $\text{antigh}(Q^I) = \text{antigh}(P^I)$. There is therefore no way to match the odd antighost number of non-trivial solutions of $\delta Q^I + \tilde{d}R^I = 0$ with the even ghost number of ω^I in order to make a non-trivial a_k . Thus, a_k is trivial and can be removed. The same argument applies then to the

successive $a_{k-1}, a_{k-2} \dots$ and we can conclude that indeed, up to trivial terms, a can be taken not to depend on the antifields, $a = a_0$. The only consistent interactions in six dimensions do not deform the gauge symmetry and are either strictly gauge-invariant ($\gamma a_0 = 0$), or gauge-invariant up to a total derivative ($\gamma a_0 + db_0 = 0$)¹.

Because they do not deform the gauge-symmetry, the off-shell gauge-invariant (up to a possible total derivative) interactions are clearly consistent to all orders, so there is no further constraint following from gauge invariance. If one imposes in addition Lorentz-invariance, then, one gets of course additional restrictions on the gauge-invariant interactions. In the case where the Lagrangian is required to involve only first-order derivatives of the fields, these restrictions are most easily analysed by using the Dirac-Schwinger criterion, which easily leads to the Perry-Schwarz condition [3] on the Hamiltonian in the case of a single field [18]. We have, however, not done it explicitly for a system with many chiral 2-forms². The Dirac-Schwinger criterion also implies consistent gravitational coupling of the chiral 2-forms [13, 18].

The present analysis clearly leads to the conclusion that all continuous, local deformations yield abelian algebras. In other words, *no local field theory of chiral two-forms continuously connected with the free theory, can describe a system of n coinciding M5-branes*. This leaves of course the non-local deformations of the abelian theory. Proposals in this direction exist [21, 22] where the two-form is used to construct a connection on the principal bundle based on the space of loops with a common point. However, this approach requires the introduction of a one-form potential which is used to parallel transport the two-form from the common point to some point on the loop. Such a one-form potential doesn't seem to appear in the M5-system. A way out would be to constrain the potentials to be flat, but even then one finds that also here the algebra remains an abelian one. Finally, three-form field-strengths and their two-form potentials find a natural geometrical setting in the context of gerbes [23]. However, there as well, a non-abelian extension of the two-form gauge-symmetry is still lacking.

Acknowledgments: We thank Kostas Skenderis and Jan Troost for discussions. X.B. and M.H. are supported in part by the “Actions de Recherche Concertées” of the “Direction de la Recherche Scientifique - Communauté Française de Belgique”, by IISN - Belgium (convention 4.4505.86) and by Proyectos FONDECYT 1970151 and 7960001 (Chile). A.S. is supported in part by the FWO and by the European Commission

¹A similar result holds for non-chiral 2-forms in six dimensions, for which the only symmetry-deforming consistent interactions are the Freedman-Townsend interactions [17, 12], but these are available in four dimensions only).

²The Dirac-Schwinger criterion is also useful for the related problem of manifestly duality-invariant formulations of electromagnetism in 4 dimensions [19] and reproduces there the condition of [20].

TMR programme ERBFMRX-CT96-0045 in which he is associated to K. U. Leuven.

References

1. A. Strominger, Phys. Lett. **B383** (1996) 44, [hep-th/9512059](#); E. Witten, J. Geom. Phys. **22** (1997) 103, [hep-th/9610234](#); E. Witten, JHEP **9801** (1998) 001, [hep-th/9710065](#)
2. N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. **B408** (1997) 98, [hep-th/9705221](#); M. Berkooz, M. Rozali and N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. **408** (1997) 105, [hep-th/9704089](#)
3. M. Perry and J. H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. **B489** (1997) 47-64, [hep-th/9611065](#)
4. J. H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **B395** (1997) 191, [hep-th/9701008](#)
5. M. Aganagic, J. Park, C. Popescu, J. H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. **B496** (1997) 191, [hep-th/9701166](#)
6. P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, Phys. Lett. **B398** (1997) 41, [hep-th/9701037](#)
7. I. Bandos, K. Lechner, A. Nurmagambetov, P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 4332, [hep-th/9701149](#)
8. I.R. Klebanov and A.A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. **B475** (1996) 164, [hep-th/9604089](#)
9. S.S. Gubser and I.R. Klebanov, Phys. Lett. **B413** 41, [hep-th/9708005](#)
10. M. Henningson and K. Skenderis, JHEP **9807** (1998) 023, [hep-th/9806087](#)
11. C. Teitelboim, Phys. Lett. **167B** (1986) 63
12. M. Henneaux and B. Knaepen, Phys. Rev. **D56** (1997) 6076, [hep-th/9706119](#); M. Henneaux, Phys. Lett. **B368** (1996) 83, [hep-th/9511145](#); M. Henneaux and B. Knaepen, Nucl. Phys. **B548** (1999) 491, [hep-th/9812140](#); M. Henneaux, B. Knaepen and C. Schomblond, Comm. Math. Phys. **186** (1997) 137, [hep-th/9606181](#)
13. M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, Phys. Lett. **B206** (1988) 650
14. G. Barnich and M. Henneaux, Phys. Lett. **B311** (1993) 123, [hep-th/9304057](#)
15. X. Bekaert, M. Henneaux and A. Sevrin, in preparation
16. G. Barnich, F. Brandt and M. Henneaux, Comm. Math. Phys. **174** (1995) 93, [hep-th/9405194](#)
17. D. Z. Freedman and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B177** (1981) 282
18. X. Bekaert and M. Henneaux, Int. J. Th. Phys. **38** (1999) 1161, [hep-th/9806062](#)
19. S. Deser and O. Sarioglu, Phys. Lett. **B423** (1998) 369, [hep-th/9712067](#)
20. G. W. Gibbons and D. A. Rasheed, Nucl. Phys. **B454** (1995) 185, [hep-th/9506035](#)
21. R.I. Nepomechie, Nucl. Phys. **B212** (1983) 301
22. O. Alvarez, L.A. Ferreira and J. Sanchez-Guillen, Nucl. Phys. **B529** (1998) 689, [hep-th/9710147](#)

23. J. Kalkkinen, JHEP **9907** (1999) 002, hep-th/9905018; N. Hitchin, math.DG/9907034